

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 VICTORIA-JOY GODWIN,

Case No. 2:17-cv-02178-MMD-DJA

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 SENIOR GARDEN APARTMENTS, *et al.*,

10 Defendants.

11
12 *Pro se* Plaintiff Victoria-Joy Godwin filed a fourth amended complaint against
13 numerous defendants, including Clark County. (ECF No. 87 at 15.) Before the Court is
14 the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States
15 Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Albregts (ECF No. 180), recommending that Defendant Clark
16 County’s request for dismissal in their motion for an order quashing service (ECF No.
17 135) be granted, and that Clark County be dismissed from this action. Plaintiff had until
18 January 19, 2021 to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed.
19 For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and dismiss Clark
20 County from the entirety of this case.

21 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
22 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
23 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
24 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
25 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
26 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
27 recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the
28 findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is
4 satisfied Judge Albregts did not clearly err. Here, Judge Albregts recommends that Clark
5 County be dismissed from this action as Plaintiff’s fourth amended complaint fails to state
6 a claim against Clark County upon which relief can be granted. (ECF No. 180 at 2.) The
7 Court agrees with Judge Albregts. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case,
8 the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

9 It is therefore ordered that Judge Albregts’s Report and Recommendation (ECF
10 No. 180) is accepted and adopted in full.

11 It is further ordered that Defendant Clark County is dismissed from the entirety of
12 this case.

13 DATED THIS 21st Day of January 2021.

14
15 
16 _____
17 MIRANDA M. DU
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28